1 2 3	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA BEAUFORT DIVISION	
4 5	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, )	
6 7	)	No. 9:18-cr-00773-DCN
8	)	2.00.9.20 02 007,0 2 02.
9 10	VS.	ORDER
11 12	MARQU' ANTHONY SINGLETON,	
13	Defendant.	
14 15	)	
16	The following matter is before the court on Marqu' Anthony Singleton's	
17	("Singleton") pro se motion to have his record expunged. ECF No. 57. On August 15,	
18	2018, Singleton was indicted for knowingly possessing a firearm and ammunition after	
19	having been convicted of a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one	
20	year, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 922(g)(1), 924(a)(2), and 924(e) ("count 1"). ECF No.	
21	1.	
22	On March 14, 2019, Singleton filed a motion	on to suppress the evidence that led to
23	count 1, based on a violation of his rights under the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Amendments.	
24	ECF No. 43. After a hearing on the motion to suppress, the government determined it	
25	would be in the best interest of justice to file a motion to dismiss count 1, without	
26	prejudice, against Singleton. ECF No. 52. On May 6, 2019, the court dismissed count 1	
27	without prejudice. ECF No. 53. On April 1, 2020, Singleton wrote a <u>pro se</u> motion in the	
28	form of a letter to the court requesting an equitable expungement of his arrest record. See	
29	ECF No. 57.	
30	Where a party seeks to adjudicate in federal court, the party "must demonstrate	
31	the federal court's jurisdiction over the matter." Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Allapattah Servs.,	

1	<u>Inc.</u> , 545 U.S. 546, 552 (2005); <u>see also Kokkonen v. Guardian Life Ins. Co. of Am.</u> , 511	
2	U.S. 375, 377 (1994) (holding federal courts "possess only that power authorized by the	
3	Constitution and statute, which is not to be expanded by judicial decree."). Since the	
4	Supreme Court decided Kokkonen in 1994, seven circuit courts have found that	
5	Kokkonen bars federal courts from invoking ancillary jurisdiction to expunge criminal	
6	records for purely equitable reasons. See United States v. Mettetal, 714 F. App'x 230,	
7	234-35 (4th Cir. 2017) (unpublished opinion) (listing cases from the First, Second, Third,	
8	Sixth, Seventh, Eighth, and Ninth Circuits). The Fourth Circuit in Mettetal held it "joins	
9	the unified front of circuit authority in rejecting" ancillary jurisdiction to hear requests for	
10	equitable expungement of arrests. <u>Id.</u> at 235.	
11	The court concludes it does not have the jurisdiction to grant Singleton the relief	
12	he seeks.	
13	Singleton's motion is, therefore, <b>DENIED</b> .	
14 15	AND IT IS SO ORDERED.	
16	- Was	
17	DAVID C. NORTON	
18 19	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
20		
21	April 30, 2020	
22	Charleston, South Carolina	